

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
DALLAS DIVISION**

RAYMOND DONNELLY, O'TARA	§	
JOHNSON, AND DANTE	§	
WILLIAMS	§	
<i>Plaintiffs,</i>	§	
v.	§	Civil Action No. 3:20-cv-1106-X
	§	
ACADEMIC PARTNERSHIPS, LLC,	§	
<i>Defendant.</i>	§	

ORDER

This matter came before the Court on Defendant Academic Partnerships, LLC's ("Defendant" or "AP") Motions to Overrule/Strike Plaintiff Donnelly's, Plaintiff Johnson's, and Plaintiff Williams' (collectively, "Plaintiffs") Discovery Objections, Motions to Compel Plaintiff Donnelly's, Plaintiff Johnson's, and Plaintiff Williams' Discovery Responses, and Award Attorneys' Fees and Briefs in Support ("Motions"). Having considered the Motions, the submissions of the parties, the arguments of counsel, and the other papers on file in this case, the Court finds Defendant's Motions should be, in all things, **GRANTED IN PART AND DENIED IN PART.**

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED:

By January 31, 2022,

- Plaintiffs must provide verified Interrogatory answers under oath with sworn affidavits as required by Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(b)(3);
- Plaintiff Donnelly is ordered to supplement his answers to Interrogatory Nos. 1–3, 5–6, 10, and 15–20 to provide complete answers to the Interrogatories;

- Plaintiff Johnson is ordered to supplement her answers to Interrogatory Nos. 1–3, 5–6, 10–11, and 15–21 to provide complete answers to the Interrogatories;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Interrogatory Nos. 9 and 12 are **sustained**;
- Plaintiff Johnson’s objections to Interrogatory Nos. 9 and 12 are **sustained**;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Request for Production 59 are **overruled**;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Request for Production 60 are **sustained**;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Request for Production 61 are **overruled**;
- Plaintiff Johnson’s objections to Request for Production 51 are **overruled**;
- Plaintiff Johnson’s objections to Request for Production 52 are **sustained**;
- Plaintiff Johnson’s objections to Request for Production 53 are **overruled**;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Requests for Production 58 and 68 are **overruled**, and he is ordered to produce documents responsive to these Requests and/or amend his responses;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Requests for Production 65 and 66 are **overruled**, and Plaintiff Donnelly is ordered to supplement his production and produce documents responsive to Requests for Production 65 and 66;
- Plaintiff Donnelly’s objections to Requests for Production 75-77 are **overruled**, and Plaintiff Donnelly is ordered to supplement his production and produce documents responsive to Requests for Production 75-77;

- Plaintiff Johnson's objections to Requests for Production 55 and 56 are **overruled**, and Plaintiff Johnson is ordered to supplement her production and produce documents responsive to Requests for Production 55 and 56;
- Plaintiff Johnson's objections to Requests for Production 67-69 are **overruled**, and Plaintiff Johnson is ordered to supplement her production and produce documents responsive to Requests for Production 67-69;
- Plaintiff Donnelly is ordered to amend his response to Request for Production 80 and produce any documents reflecting social media posts regarding the events that underlie the claims or defenses of this lawsuit; and
- Plaintiff Johnson is ordered to amend her response to Request for Production 73 and produce any documents reflecting social media posts regarding the events that underlie the claims or defenses of this lawsuit.
- When producing documents, each Plaintiff must identify which documents that plaintiff is producing.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED:

- **Within thirty (30) days** of the Court's ruling on Defendant's 12(c) Motion for Judgment on the Pleadings on Plaintiff Dante Williams' Claims and Brief in Support, Plaintiff Dante Williams is ordered to amend or supplement his answers and responses as follows, unless the Court's ruling renders the request moot:
 - Plaintiff Williams is ordered to supplement his answers to Interrogatory Nos. 1-2, 5-6, 10, and 15-20 to provide complete answers to the Interrogatories;
 - Plaintiff Williams' objections to Requests for Production 68, 69, and 78-80 and are **overruled**, and Plaintiff Williams is ordered to supplement his production and produce documents responsive to these Requests;
 - Plaintiff Williams' objections to Interrogatory Nos. 9 is **sustained**;

- Plaintiff Williams' objections to Request for Production 62 are **overruled**;
- Plaintiff Williams' objections to Request for Production 63 are **sustained**;
- Plaintiff Williams' objections to Request for Production 64 are **overruled**;
- Plaintiff Williams' objections to Requests for Production 20, 65, 77, and 86 are **overruled**, and he is ordered to produce documents responsive to these Requests or amend his responses; and
- Plaintiff Williams is ordered to amend his response to Request for Production 83 and produce any documents reflecting posts regarding the events that underlie the claims or defenses of this lawsuit.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's request for reasonable attorneys' fees is **DENIED**.

SO ORDERED.

January 3, 2022.



REBECCA RUTHERFORD
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE